

through a device? Come on. This is clear.

You go to any school. I defy my colleagues, try this. Go to any school in your State and say: By the way, how many of you have asthma? You will see the little hands go up. Then you say: How many of you know someone with asthma? You will see half the class raise their hands. Yet what are we doing on this beautiful bill—that Senator LANDRIEU, I know, wants to have cleaned up? She doesn't want these amendments on it. Regardless of how she may feel or I may feel, we both agree we should not have these amendments on it, but so be it. We have to vote these amendments down because we are responsible for these kids. All our side is saying is very simple: The Clean Air Act has worked.

If I went up to you and I said: If you know something worked perfectly well, would you mess with it? Would you change it?

No. Why would you, if it is working well?

So let's take a look at how well the Clean Air Act is working. I know how strong the belief of the Presiding Officer is on this subject. Let's take a look at this.

In 2010, the Clean Air Act prevented 160,000 cases of premature deaths. By 2020, that number is projected to rise to 230,000 cases of premature death. So if we stay on course and we fool around with the Clean Air Act—as my Republican friends have already done in the House and I pray to God they do not succeed—we are going to see more deaths in 2020.

In 2010, the Clean Air Act prevented 1.7 million fewer asthma attacks. I showed you the picture of those children. Why do we want to mess with that? The Clean Air Act prevented 10,000 acute heart attacks. You read the stories: So-and-so went out on a heavy, bad air day, took a little jog, and collapsed.

I have to tell you, we have a success story to tell about what the Clean Air Act is doing. I will show a chart of what happened in Los Angeles. A lot of you go to my beautiful State. I know the chairman of the committee said she was just there, and it was a terrific visit to my State. We have a magnificent State. But there were times when you went to Los Angeles that you saw the air. That is not a good thing. When you see the air, that is a bad thing. The air was thick. People were told on many mornings: Do not go out unless you must. The air is so dangerous.

The Clean Air Act passed. Guess what. In 2010, we have had no mornings like that—none. We went from 166 days a year of health advisories in southern California to none in 2010. I have to say, if you show me any other law that has had this record of success, I will smile and be happy. We went from 166 days a year of smog advisories to none because of the Clean Air Act. I have already told you, we have saved lives, saved asthma attacks. We have done it

all. Yet there are people in this Chamber who want to either postpone enforcing the Clean Air Act as it relates to carbon or want to stop it forever, which is the McConnell amendment and the worst amendment of them all, if I had to rate them.

I have a couple other charts to share with you and then I will close. The McConnell amendment, which is the worst of all amendments—none of them are good—they all interfere with the Environmental Protection Agency, which is supported, the EPA, by 69 percent of the people.

But the McConnell amendment is a disaster. It is the same as the Upton amendment, the Upton bill in the House, and the Inhofe bill in the Senate. The McConnell amendment—what does it do? It says that forever more, the EPA cannot do anything to regulate carbon pollution regardless of how dangerous it is, regardless of what the scientists tell us, regardless of what the physicians tell us, regardless of what the people tell us through the polls, regardless of what our communities tell us, what our States tell us, what our mayors tell us. Forever more, they are repealing the Clean Air Act as it relates to carbon pollution. Rather extreme. Outrageous. We have to beat it. We must beat it. It is so bad. It goes against the Supreme Court decision. By the way, there will be lawsuits up the wazoo if it ever becomes law, and it will not, I pray.

The Supreme Court said that if we find—scientists—that carbon pollution is dangerous, we have to regulate it. Guess what. The scientists found that carbon pollution is dangerous. They made an endangerment finding. The EPA is ready to act, I think in a judicious way. They are very mindful. They are not going after farms, they are not going after small businesses. That is not good enough for these special interests who took out this huge ad today standing against—it is a beautiful ad. It looks almost environmental, green. This is not green; it is dirty—dirty air. That is what this ad stands for—dirty air.

A lot of people did not want me to come back here because they knew I would come here and tell the truth about this. But I am here, and I am going to tell the truth every day in every way because I love my grandkids and I love everybody's grandkids. As far as I am concerned, that is why I am here—not to protect the rich polluters who make billions of dollars a year. They can clean up their act. We proved it. We proved it. We have said we do not want kids struggling for air, and we said we can do this right. We proved it. We not only proved we can clean up the air, we not only proved we can save lives, we not only proved we can save asthma attacks, we proved we can grow this economy.

I am going to close now and let my friend from Louisiana have the floor, but I have to close with this. There is a lot of talk about how this is bad for

business. But the fact is, every time the polluters get up and say: Do not pass any more Clean Air Act amendments, it is going to be bad for jobs. We found out that cleaning up the environment actually creates jobs. Not only does it create jobs, it creates new technologies. Not only does it create new technologies, but those technologies are exported to the world. And I will have printed in the RECORD the number of jobs that have been created as we moved to clean up the air.

So the reason I am here—and I think it is quite a spirited discussion I am having with all of you—is because we are facing four bad amendments—four, count them, the worst being McConnell—all of which would either slow down the EPA or stop the EPA.

By the way, the McConnell amendment is so terrible that it even says EPA can no longer have anything to do with tailpipe emissions of cars, which is such an important part of the dirty air we are facing.

In closing, according to information from the Institute of Clean Air Companies—those are American companies that oppose these big polluting companies—from 1999 to 2001, the number of boilermakers in the United States increased by 6,700—a 35-percent increase—even though we said: You have to clean up the air.

The Department of Commerce shows that the U.S. environmental technology industry generated \$300 billion in revenues, supported 1.7 million jobs. The air pollution control sector produced \$18 billion in revenue. Small and medium-sized companies make up 99 percent of the private sector firms in this sector of the economy.

So here is what you have. You have these huge, multibillion-dollar polluters who can afford to take one-page ads, full-page ads in the Washington Post. They want to continue polluting the air, and they don't want to clean it up. And you have a whole other group of businesses that have written to us and said: Please let the EPA do its work. It saves lives, it saves our children, and it creates many jobs—new jobs, clean jobs, good jobs.

If we go down the path of the McConnell amendment and these other amendments, we are ceding our leadership in environmental clean tech to China. That is the last thing we want to do. They are already surpassing us in solar production, and we created it.

So the bill before us is a fine bill. I hope, if we have to vote for these amendments, and they do come up as part of this agreement as we move forward, we will not pass any of them and we will allow the people to have their way. Sixty-nine percent of them say: Let the EPA do its job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from Louisiana.

#### U.S. ENERGY PRODUCTION

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, since President Obama took office, the price

of a gallon of gasoline at the pump has risen 96 percent—96 percent, from \$1.83 to now \$3.60, with absolutely no end in sight. Meanwhile, and not coincidentally, the President has virtually shut down the Gulf of Mexico, he has canceled numerous energy lease sales, he has refused to act on stalled onshore permits, he has dramatically increased environmental regulations, and he has begun regulating CO<sub>2</sub> by administrative fiat. All of that has helped get us to where we are.

Today, President Obama went to Georgetown University, and at least he has begun focusing on and addressing the energy situation. I guess I give him points for that. He went to Georgetown today and delivered a speech which he called a Blueprint for a Secure Energy Future. But, like a lot of Presidential speeches, this is great-sounding rah-rah, nice title but pretty disappointing, from my point of view, on substance.

First of all, let's talk about the whole premise of the speech, a Blueprint for a Secure Energy Future. I was hopeful, on hearing about the plan for this speech, that we would be seeing an unveiling of a real energy policy, including moving in the right direction in terms of domestic production, utilizing our domestic energy resources. Unfortunately, this is more of the same. In fact, the President admits freely that this is absolutely more of the same. He says:

Today, my administration is releasing a Blueprint for a Secure Energy Future that outlines the comprehensive national energy policy we have pushed since the day I took office.

So this is simply a restatement of the last years of policy, in my opinion, clearly failed, clearly counter-productive policy that has helped get us to \$3.60 at the pump and climbing.

When you look even more at the substance of the speech, it is more disappointing. The whole speech is about 51 paragraphs. Of those 51 paragraphs, I looked to see how many are about tapping our domestic traditional energy resources. Well, 6 paragraphs of 51—just a little over 10 percent. Four paragraphs were about domestic oil production, and two were about domestic natural gas production. And even those two were mostly about possibly increasing regulation on the production of natural gas from shale, making it more difficult, not accessing more of our domestic energy resources.

What is the picture on domestic oil production, those four paragraphs? Well, the President says:

To keep reducing that reliance on imports, my administration is encouraging offshore oil exploration and production.

Really? That is a news headline to my constituents in the gulf coast because every day we live a far different reality. We live the reality of an administration that has moved in the opposite direction, making domestic oil and gas production far more difficult, not easier.

Since the tragedy of the BP disaster, we have only had 7 deepwater explor-

atory permits issued—7 issued—compared to a comparable period before the disaster of 68, so about 10 percent. That is encouraging offshore oil and gas exploration and production? I don't think so. Since that disaster, the working rotary rigs in the gulf have fallen dramatically, from about 55 to 25. It has been cut by more than half. That is encouraging offshore oil exploration and production? I don't think so.

We need to change the policy that is virtually shutting down the gulf and stopping domestic energy production. Seven deepwater exploratory permits is not adequate. Seven, as I said, is roughly 10 percent of the rate that existed before. Of course we need to make changes, and we have. Of course we need to learn the lessons of the Deepwater Horizon explosion, and we have. But, again, seven is roughly 10 percent of the previous rate.

We need to do far better, and if we are going to really encourage that domestic production, what about production in Alaska's Beaufort Sea? EPA is sitting on those permits, not issuing those permits. As a result, Shell Oil announced that it is abandoning efforts to produce anything there. Is that what the President is talking about, encouraging oil exploration and production?

What about the lease sales he canceled? President Obama canceled the western lease sale that was scheduled. He canceled that in May of 2010. If you are serious, are you going to reverse that decision? Also, in May of 2010, the President canceled the planned Virginia lease sale. Unfortunately, in this speech, he did not reverse that policy. He is continuing that cancellation.

What about the cancellation of offshore tracts in Alaska's Cook Inlet? The President canceled that in March of this year, this month. Unfortunately, in this speech, he did not reverse that policy.

Withdrawn leases. The President's Department of the Interior has withdrawn 77 lease sales in Utah that were planned. They withdrew those in 2009. No reversal on that policy. Is that encouraging oil exploration and production?

So time and again the President has actually worked in the opposite direction—shutting down domestic production, making it more difficult, not, as he said in his speech today, "encouraging oil exploration and production."

We need a new energy policy, not a restated policy, not the same-old same-old from the last 2 years. We need a policy that does many things, including harnessing and accessing our enormous abundance of energy resources in this country.

You know, we Americans are not used to thinking of ourselves as energy-rich, but we are. And nonpartisan, nonbiased sources such as the Congressional Research Service say we are the most energy-rich country in the world bar none. The only country coming close to us is Russia in terms of our vast array and amount of domestic en-

ergy resources. We are out of the habit of thinking of ourselves that way for a simple reason: The Congress and this President in particular have taken 95 percent of those abundant resources and put them off limits under Federal law. No other energy-rich country does anything like that. We continue to do it even with the price at the pump rising so dramatically.

We need to stop that. We need to access our own richness, our own resources to take care of ourselves. And that is a big part of the energy plan we need, which, unfortunately, was not part of the President's Blueprint for a Secure Energy Future unveiled today, restated today, at Georgetown.

Many colleagues will join me tomorrow in introducing a bill that lays out that new energy vision to unlock the enormous potential we have here at home. The bill is called 3-D: The Domestic Jobs, Domestic Energy and Deficit Reduction Act of 2011. I am honored to be joined by between 20 and 30 colleagues—the list is still growing—who will formally introduce that act tomorrow. This is legislation aimed at our domestic energy resources, unshackling that potential, letting us get access to that enormous potential for domestic energy and, with it, great U.S. jobs, jobs right here in this country, and deficit reduction. So many of the primary challenges we face find their nexus in energy. Again, energy independence, self-reliance we need now more than ever, particularly with the unrest in the Middle East.

Secondly, jobs. We say we are trying to do everything we can to come out of this tough recession, but we are not, because the U.S. energy sector has the potential for enormous job growth. Again, we have taken a large percentage of those resources, 95 percent, and put it off limits.

With deficit reduction, along with producing more domestic energy, would come tremendous revenue to the Federal Government. After the personal income tax, this is the top source of Federal revenue—royalties on domestic energy production—second only to the personal income tax. Again, why don't we solve all of these problems—energy independence, U.S. jobs, and deficit reduction—by fully and aggressively developing our U.S. domestic energy sector?

Specifically, the 3-D bill would do six primary things. First, it mandates Outer Continental Shelf lease sales, directing the Interior Department to conduct a lease sale in each Outer Continental Shelf planning area for which there is a commercial interest. It would also consider the 2010-2015 planning area complete.

Secondly, it would open ANWR to energy production. This is a vast source of potential energy production, job creation, and deficit reduction, again, that we have put off limits through congressional and Presidential action.

Third, it would require action on stalled onshore permits, things such as

the leases that Interior withdrew in 2009 in Utah, things such as EPA inaction, actually withdrawing a CWA permit for the Spruce No. 1 mine in West Virginia, the State Department sitting on the permit issue in terms of the Keystone XL pipeline project, the EPA not issuing permits for Shell Oil operations in offshore Alaska. It would direct action in all of those areas.

Fourth, it would properly limit timeframes for environmental and judicial review. It would not change any of those review standards. It would only change the law so that those reviews could not go on ad infinitum. It would streamline the process and properly and reasonably limit those timeframes.

Fifth, it would block regulation of CO<sub>2</sub> by administrative fiat. We will have a vote soon on that issue. I am hopeful it will be a majority vote in favor of this opinion to block that regulation by administrative fiat that I espouse. This is also included in the 3-D bill.

Sixth, we would actually create an alternative energy trust fund from 25 percent of the new revenue produced from ANWR. It would capture 25 percent of that brandnew revenue for alternative energy development, research, and production. That would be positive as well.

This is the sort of domestic energy focus we need. This is the movement toward real energy security as well as job creation and deficit reduction that I would have hoped the President would have at least hinted at at Georgetown today. But he did not. His speech was the same old same old, explicitly restating what he has been doing for the last 2 years.

I urge all colleagues to join in this effort and to join in similar efforts. Americans face tough times. It is not being made any easier by the price at the pump going up. Again, since President Obama took office, that price has risen 96 percent, from \$1.83 per gallon to \$3.60 per gallon, and there is no end in sight. We need to access our own resources. We need to put Americans to work. We need to reduce our deficit with that extra new revenue. We can do it all by accessing U.S. domestic energy resources more fully, not putting 95 percent of those resources off limits, off the table by either Presidential fiat or congressional action.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us in this effort, to join similar efforts to give Americans real relief at the pump, to increase our energy independence, to lower the deficit, and to produce good American jobs.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MERKLEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the benefit of all Senators, we have been trying in the last 24 hours or more to work our way through the amendments to get to a vote on this most important bill we are dealing with, the small business innovation bill, a bill that has already created thousands of jobs around the country. It is an extremely important bill. We need to reauthorize this bill. It is a very small amount of money. It generates a lot of jobs. But we have been stuck.

I think we have had a breakthrough that we can at least, hopefully, work toward conclusion of this extremely difficult matter. I have spoken with one Senator who had a concern about an issue that has actually been held up—it is a Republican amendment held up by a Republican—not allowing us to have a vote on it. I think we have worked our way through that. Now the floor staff is trying to come up with a consent agreement that would work toward having a vote develop the will of the Senate on the 1099, the tax reporting requirement. Also, there are a number of amendments people wish to have votes on dealing with EPA standards. I think we are at a place where we can perhaps set up some votes.

With the difficulty of all the things we have today, including a briefing by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs on Libya, I think realistically we will not have any votes this afternoon. Tomorrow morning we have the funeral in New York for Geraldine Ferraro. We will work very hard to set up a series of votes for tomorrow afternoon. It could be a significant number of votes. It could be 10 votes or so tomorrow afternoon, and if it has to spill over into Friday, we will have to do that. At least I think we can get the voting done tomorrow. With a little bit of good fortune, we can work with the few problems we still have outstanding and move forward with Senator LANDRIEU's bill on which she and Senator SNOWE have worked hard.

I hope this let's Senators know what we are doing. Even though it seems like nothing, there has been a lot of work that has gone into this. It is fair to say we will have no more votes today, and we will try to get something set up for tomorrow afternoon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ENERGY SUBSIDIES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, often I come to the Senate floor to talk about alternative energy. Most of the

time it is about biofuels. Sometimes it is about wind, because I am the author of the wind energy tax credit. Sometimes it is to speak about it. Hardly ever do I come to the floor to talk about it in regard to the attempt to amend a certain bill on the floor. I come for that purpose now, and I come to express my strong opposition to amendment No. 220 filed at the desk by Senator COBURN.

I don't find any fault with the issue Senator COBURN raises, only when it is raised. I sense from some of his arguments and press releases that it is raised to bring up the issue of energy and what energy should be subsidized or not subsidized, or whether any energy ought to be subsidized, and also maybe to point out some things that are wrong with the Tax Code. I can't find any fault with any of those motives. I only find fault, let's say, in the sense that it is being brought up to show that there are some things wrong with the Tax Code and the Tax Code ought to be reformed.

Yes, if anybody said the Tax Code was a perfect piece of work, you might think: Well, you have been in Washington too long or you don't exercise good judgment or you are not in the real world. So I think it is perfectly legitimate to bring up issues about the Tax Code, but in the sense of reform of the Tax Code, not as an isolated amendment to some other bill, for the simple reason that if you do that, with the complexity of our Tax Code—reforming it in that way—every Senator attempting to do that would be growing a long gray beard for the years it would take to do it piecemeal. Hopefully, we can get it done sometime in the context of tax reform and tax simplification, or flat tax or fair tax, and also with the corporation tax.

As to the motive for bringing up subsidies for energy, it is a perfectly legitimate subject to bring up, but it ought to be brought up in the context of a national energy policy. I believe Senator COBURN is like me. He feels if you are going to have a growing economy, you have to have a growth in the use of energy, except for possible conservation. If you are going to do more for more people, you are going to have to have an increase in the use of energy. So it is in that vein that I state my opposition to the Coburn amendment.

Senator COBURN's amendment would raise the tax on domestic energy production by repealing an incentive for the use of homegrown renewable ethanol. I am astonished, given our current situation, that there are some who would prefer less domestic energy production. With conflicts in the Middle East and crude oil over \$100 a barrel, we should be on the same side.

I have always considered myself on the same side as Senator COBURN on energy issues. We should all be on the side of more domestically produced energy, and that would be nuclear, it could be alternative energy, and it